UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

Renaissance on the Campus - - - *W. Waldemar W. Argow, II*

Health Security and the American Public - - - - - *Michael M. Davis*

Peace Through Insurance - - - - - *Ramsden Balmforth*

A Program of Resettlement - - - - - *Hans H. Baasch*

Death Comes for the Child - *Don West*

The Study Table

VOLUME CXVII NUMBER 5

Chicago, May 4, 1936

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Semi-Monthly Until Further Notice — *Subscription $3.00 Single Copies 15 cents*

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter May 24, 1935, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* — CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Board of Directors

MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, President
MRS. E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-President
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS, Treasurer
MRS. FRANCIS NEILSON
MRS. O. T. KNIGHT
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MRS. E. E. SMITH
MR. FRANCIS NEILSON
ROBERT C. SCHALLER
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
JABEZ T. SUNDERLAND
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY
JAMES H. WEST

Poetry Editors

LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Editorial Contributors

W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
RAYMOND B. BRAGG
EDMUND B. CHAFFEE
PERCY M. DAWSON
ALBERT C. DIEFFENBACH
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
LOUIS L. MANN
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
M. C. OTTO
ALSON H. ROBINSON

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL—
Notes 83
Jottings—J. H. H. 86
ARTICLES—
Renaissance on the Campus—W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW, II 86
Health Security and the American Public—MICHAEL M. DAVIS 88
Peace Through Insurance—RAMSDEN BALMFORTH 90
A Program of Resettlement—HANS H. BAASCH 93
Death Comes for the Child—DON WEST 94
POETRY—
Respectfully Dedicated to Benito Mussolini and His Italians—*William Cowper* 83
Indelible Number—ANNE PENCE DAVIS 92
In Ethiopia—LUCIA TRENT 97
THE STUDY TABLE—
Is This the Way Out?—GEORGE MAYCHIN STOCKDALE 95
America and Europe—TARAKNATH DAS 96
An Arabian Night's Entertainment—LYLE CORS 97
CORRESPONDENCE—
Reply to AAA Editorial—H. G. ZUCKERMAN 98
How Can This Country Stay Out of War?—HARIDAS T. MUZUMDAR 99
THE FIELD—
The Program of the "Front Populaire"—*World Events* 82
A Belligerent Cardinal—*Nofrontier News Service* 100
Mr. Roosevelt's 3-Years' Work—DR. HARRY ELMER BARNES, New York *World-Telegram* 100

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

The Program of the "Front Populaire"

By Camille Drevet

The impending French elections are confidently expected to carry the Front Populaire to power. But what is the Front Populaire and what is its program?

This French "united front" comprises ten major organizations and 90 minor ones. It ranges from libertarian and democratic groups to the Communist Party. It includes laborers and intellectuals, farmers and women, pacifists and anti-fascists. Among its leaders are such renowned names as Victor Basch, Paul Rivet, Leon Jouhaux and Paul Faure.

The program elaborated by these diverse groups was necessarily a compromise, but its purpose was declared to be "to defend democratic liberties, to give bread to the workers, work to youth and peace to the world." Just how are these goals to be realized?

1. Defense of Liberty—Here there are contemplated measures for general amnesty, for dissolution of the fascist leagues, for the freedom of the press, for syndical liberties, and for defense of lay schools. As for the colonies, it is proposed to set up a parliamentary commission "on the political, moral, and economic situation of French territories across the seas."

2. Defense of Peace—This part of the program leans heavily on the League of Nations. It seeks "international collaboration for collective security by defining the aggressor and by automatic and joint application of sanctions." An appeal is to be made to all nations to return to Geneva. There is further contemplated "simultaneous and controlled reduction of armaments by all nations," the nationalization of war industries, the repudiation of secret diplomacy, the peaceful alteration of treaties, and the extension of the Franco-Soviet pact to all countries.

3. Economic Provisions—In this section the Front Populaire proposes the following reforms: reestablishment of purchasing power, creation of funds for the unemployed, reduction of working hours without reduction of salaries, old age pensions, higher prices for farm

(Continued on page 99)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXVII MONDAY, MAY 4, 1936 No. 5

RESPECTFULLY DEDICATED TO BENITO MUSSOLINI AND HIS ITALIANS

. . . Conscious of impotence, they soon grow drunk
With gazing, when they see an able man
Step forth to notice, and besotted thus,
Build him a pedestal, and say, "Stand there,
And be our admiration and our praise."
They roll themselves before him in the dust,
Then most deserving in their own account
When most extravagant in his applause,
As if exalting him they raised themselves.
Thus by degrees, self-cheated of their sound
And sober judgment, that he is but a man,
They demi-deify and fume him so,
That in due season he forgets it too.
Inflated and astrut with self-conceit,
He gulps the windy diet, and ere long,
Adopting their mistake, profoundly thinks
The world was made in vain, if not for him.
Thenceforth they are his cattle: drudges born
To bear his burdens, drawing in his gears,
And sweating in his service; his caprice
Becomes the soul that animates them all.
He deems a thousand, or ten thousand lives,
Spent in the purchase of renown for him,
An easy reckoning, and they think the same. . . .
Strange, that such folly as lifts bloated man
To eminence fit only for a god
Should ever drivel out of human lips,
Even in the cradled weakness of the world!

William Cowper.

THE APPEAL TO YOUTH

President Roosevelt's speech in Baltimore to the Young Democrats had much to commend it. The speech was in many ways in his best vein. But it had its sinister aspects which are not to be ignored. We confess, as we read his words of appeal to and flattery of the young, we found ourselves thinking of Mussolini and what he had done to and with the youth of Italy. Then our mind went wandering off to Hitler, and recalling how his whole movement has been founded upon the support of disillusioned and deceived youth. Was Roosevelt taking pattern from these dictators? Of course not! But he may be doing carelessly and impulsively and lightheartedly—just as he does everything in that way!—what another abler and less scrupulous man may later on do advisedly in his own interest. It's dangerous business, this singling out of youth and promising them lavish indulgences in return for political support. The young generation in Italy, after the war, was in a condition of devastating despair. Then Mussolini came along with his infectious promises, and the juveniles fell for him to a man. German youth, after Versailles, the inflation, and the futility of the Republic, were similarly lost. They saw before them nothing but empty lives and frustrated desires. The world had no need of them and thus no place for them. Then Hitler appeared, challenged the younger generation to his support, and they succumbed with enthusiasm. And to this day Mussolini and Hitler are subsisting on the allegiance of youth. Now the condition of the young people in this country today is not so different from that of the young people of Germany and Italy yesterday. This means that they are unwittingly so much tinder to catch the flame of any demagogue that comes along. Youth is charming, lovable, fresh, energetic, idealistic, heroic, sacrificial, but also inexperienced, naive, foolish, impulsive, easily deceived and misled. We saw in this speech of Roosevelt, aimed straight at dissatisfied and bewildered youth, and in youth's ecstatic response thereto, more signs of Fascism in America than we like to contemplate.

ABUNDANCE, WEALTH AND RECOVERY

President Green, of the American Federation of Labor, has made a great discovery. It is that everybody in this country should be put to work, producing all the wealth that can be produced, and then that the abundance should be distributed around to the workers. Elementary, my dear Watson, elementary! But why hasn't Mr. Green discovered this before? Or, if he has known it all along, as we suspect, why has he been supporting an administration which has sought to produce but one thing, *scarcity,* to the end of high prices, big profits, and—continued idleness and starvation? Our guess is that the Roosevelt administration is destined to be remembered as the government which reduced the existing economic system to its final absurdity, and thus made it ridiculous as well as damnable. The AAA, with its barefaced paying of farmers to destroy crops and remain idle, is of course the prize joker of all time. People will cite this to the end of creation as the supreme inanity of modern times, as the question of angels dancing on needle points was the supreme inanity of medieval times. But scarcely less naive, or insane, is this Works Program, which is spending well over $4,000,000,000 to keep hundreds of thousands of men busy at "boondoggling," by which is

meant anything and everything which is of no imaginable use to anybody. The idea of putting these men into the factories and working them day and night producing food and clothing and shoes, or setting them to work rearing houses in city and town, this, of course, is out of the question, for this would be producing wealth for general consumption, and we can't have that under the existing order. So the fields lie fallow, and the factories remain closed, and the machines rust, and the millions languish on relief, or play at building dog-houses or making gold-fish bowls! If *Alice in Wonderland* was ever funnier than this, we have yet to see it. Yet it is Mr. Tugwell, grand panjandrum of this administration, who prates and pules about "the more abundant life"!

A FARMER-LABOR PARTY

Is a third party on the way? The Farmer Laborites of Minnesota are all for it. In Wisconsin there is already a third party, the La Follettites, who are now acting in conjunction with the Roosevelt Democrats, but could better be joining hands with new political groups. Earl Browder, leader of the Communists in this country, came out for a Farmer-Labor party in his famous radio broadcast the other day. And now comes Norman Thomas to endorse the idea on behalf of the left-wing Socialists who are slowly but surely capturing the party from the so-called old guard. That it is too late now to accomplish anything in the forthcoming presidential campaign seems generally agreed. The year 1940 rather than this present year 1936 is the objective. But meanwhile thought is active and plans are many. The success of a third party idea, it seems to us, must hang upon the recognition of immediate rather than remote objectives. What happened to the Socialist Party when the Detroit platform attempted to lay down policies for the millenium should be taken as fair warning for this movement. If all the various interests concerned are to be brought in—Farmers, Laborites, Socialists, Communists, intellectuals, radicals generally—the third party must aim straight and sure at present dangers. The challenge at the moment, as we see it, is Fascism, as equally latent in the Republican and Democratic Parties, and in such bi-partisan groups as the Liberty League. In opposition to this peril must be organized "the united front," and this same "front" can take no better shape than that of the third party which we are now discussing. To this purpose, of imperative urgency, must be subordinated every remoter issue. Let the basis of organization be the high resolve to preserve the liberties of this nation, and to seek the wider liberties implicit in the exigencies of a new and troubled age. Then, with Fascism obliterated, and the discipline of common action to a common end well learned, the third party may move on to higher levels and look out upon wider landscapes. Who knows but what Fascism may do us the priceless service of giving us that third party for which we have longed and labored through so many years?

A WORLD CONFERENCE FOR PEACE

It's a great idea—that the nations of Europe, or of the world, should gather together in a great conference to survey the present international muddle and avoid war before it is too late. The virtue of this proposal, as definitely put forth by France, for example, is that it is based on the recognition that the world cannot go on much longer as things are today. Moving from one crisis to another, mankind is sooner or later bound to fall into disaster. The weakness of the proposal is that we have had world conferences before, all the way from Vienna in 1815 to Versailles in 1919, and no one of them has been able to accomplish anything. It may be said that the Versailles Conference, like the Vienna, was conducted in the fever of post-war fear and hate. But where is there any evidence today that we have yet escaped the post-war fever that seized us after the Armistice, and consumes us still? Whatever the good in theory, there can be no good in practice of representatives of jealous and hostile nations coming together each to insist upon his own advantage and to ignore the common interest. If an international conference is to achieve durable conditions of peace, each government must sit down at the council table prepared not to gain, but to give. There must be sacrifice all around, and humility, and profound compassion and understanding. Is this spirit in the world? We see little of it in the great Fascist powers, Japan, Italy, and Germany, and little of it also in England and France as they contend now for mutual advantage at Geneva. The fact is the nations are already at war with one another, and any conference will be but an occasion for making moves, as on a chess-board, to checkmate the enemy. Unless there can be a change of temper and temperature, we are opposed to another world conference. One Versailles is enough for this generation.

GERMAN NATIONALISM REACHES OUT

Ludwig Lore, accomplished foreign news commentator of the New York *Post*, calls attention to an incident in the recent Nazi election in Germany which he well says "did not get the attention it deserves." This is the fact that, in the aforesaid election, three Austrians and two Czecho-Slovakians were chosen to the new Reichstag. This may seem amazing in a country as nationalistic as Hitler's Germany, but what it indicates is that German nationalism does not confine itself within German borders. The Nazis have the imperial idea. They are proposing to extend their frontiers to include any country which has a German population, or in which the Nazi regime can be planted. In a few years, says Lore, "the Reich parliament will contain members from Holland, Switzerland, Denmark, Sweden, the Baltic states, Rumania, Jugoslavia, Poland, and Hun-

gary." And why not, says the Fuehrer—in anticipation of the time when these lands, in whole or in part, will be German territory? Already in all these countries, Hitler's ceaseless propaganda is going on. Propaganda aimed at the same kind of result as has already been achieved in Danzig! Here, some time ago, the government was taken over by the Nazis by due vote of the citizens. Now a plebiscite is being arranged, in which the Danzigers will be asked to vote, among other things, on the question, "Are you in favor of a German Danzig?" Upper Silesia is in a ferment of Nazi excitement. Poland is surging with well-cultivated Nazi sentiment. Austria is ready to drop into the Nazi grasp the moment Mussolini is too busy, or too embarrassed by trouble elsewhere, to interfere. Latvia has unearthed a secret Nazi organization with branches in more than fifty cities and towns, and has arrested since March 15 last, some sixty-two National Socialist conspirators. Switzerland has constant border troubles with Nazi agitators. "We must weaken Switzerland economically, if we would win it to our cause," says a recent Nazi communique from Munich. Thus does the work go on, with Nazi imperialist designs which make the Kaiser's old Bagdad railroad idea seem like a pleasant gesture of goodwill. What wonder that Europe is in a muddle of fear and hate, and peace never so far away!

CHURCH AND STATE

The London correspondent of the *Christian Century* sends a story to his paper which ought to carry 'round the world. On a certain Sunday, in Liverpool Cathedral, Canon Davey arose and said to the congregation, "Today, you will have observed, we of the Chapter of Liverpool have not been able in our customary manner to commend the proposals of our ministers of state unto the blessing of Almighty God. We are persuaded that to offer unto God for the purposes of truth and peace what has been done in our name this week would only be possible with contrition and shame." The rage which this action stirred in super-patriot hearts is beyond all measure. Mr. Duff Cooper confessed that he was almost tempted to do what Henry II did to Becket, altogether forgetting in his nationalistic wrath that time has justified not the King but the Archbishop! What is the logic of this rage if not the assertion that the church shall sustain and bless whatever the ministers of state may choose to do? "My country, right or wrong"—that is to be not only the slogan of the government but the precept of the church of God! But the Liverpool Chapter will not have it so, nor will any churchman who understands aright the meaning of religion and the mission of the church. If anything is clear, it is that the church must be independent of the state in the sense that its mind and action are determined by moral and spiritual ideals and not by practical expedients of political policy. The church in its high office must *judge*—judge if this or that is consistent with the will of God. If consistent, it may be blessed; if not, it must be cursed, or at least *not* blessed. Did not Isaiah so understand it, and Jesus, and Savonorola, and Luther and Theodore Parker, and now Niemöller and Jacoby in Nazi Germany? Canon Davey is only entering upon the great inheritance. The church, be it known, is not the prayer-arm of the state. On the contrary, it is the mentor of the state. Let our premiers and presidents, politicians generally, beware! There have been times—alas, too often!—when the church would echo the words of kings and call them the words of God. But the action of the Liverpool Chapter strengthens us in the conviction that that time is going, or is gone.

THE EASTER DEBAUCH!

This editorial is written the morning after Easter. We have just been looking at the pages of pictures of the church-goers on Fifth and Park Avenues, all the millionaire swells, parading in finery that has cost fortunes in a city reeking with poverty and distress! Mingled with these pictures are photographs of churches besieged by crowds of men and women, who are never seen on any other occasion of the religious year. One story and picture particularly fascinated us. A two-column spread headline read:

"Mrs. Harp Would Rewed
If No. 2 Gave Her a Million."

Never having heard of Mrs. Harp and wondering at her first-page prominence, we read on to discover that "she is a model . . . a young brunette . . . and comes from an old navy family." She is separated from her husband, and is living with her mother who is divorced. She is considering remarriage, but "would certainly expect some kind of settlement in advance. The only time you can get money out of a man is at first, when it's all excitement. After you start fighting, why then it's no use, don't you know." And in addition to money, she must have "an agreement to release me in six months"! Accompanying this charming story, with its exalted ideas of marriage, is a photograph of "Mrs. Georgiana Cusacks Harp, as she left Easter services at St. Thomas'." Here is a typical specimen. This girl is one of thousands in New York, millions in the nation at large, who made of this Easter day one grand debauch. What do these society grandees care about religion? What do they know about Jesus, the Nazarene? Why should they enter the churches to celebrate his resurrection and to hear of His Kingdom? It might be good for them to come if they heard once the truth about themselves and their wanton lives and their unholy wealth. But the church flatters and fawns upon them, pampers and pets them, and thus itself conspires for the debauch in which these wastrels riotously indulge. Mrs. Harp will marry, if the man will settle on her a million dollars. So the church will bless, if the worldlings of the day will give her riches. Easter, far more than Christmas, is a pagan festival!

Jottings

"Jim" Farley says that he has not the slightest intention of resigning either as Postmaster General or Chairman of the Democratic National Committee. Just like Sinbad's "Old Man of the Sea"!

The Polish Minister for Public Education, according to the Rumanian *Lutta,* has announced that expenditures for military preparedness are so great that the necessary funds are not available for education. "Of the 5,500,000 children covered by the education law, about 1,000,000 receive no tuition because of lack of funds." German, Italian, French, Jugoslavian, Austrian, Bulgarian, Hungarian, Belgian, English, Japanese, American, and all other papers in the world, please copy!

Women screamed with laughter at a recent fashion show when they saw the short dresses they wore some eight or ten years ago. What will they do, we wonder, when they are shown some eight or ten years hence the hats they are wearing today? If they don't *die* with laughter, it won't be the fault of the hats!

We are not surprised that the Nazis are disciplining Hugo Eckener. This great Zeppelin flyer is winning admiration and honor from all the world. But praise from "lesser breeds" is anathema to Nazis, so of course he must be punished.

So M. Herriot thinks that France lost a friend when she "welshed" on her debt to the United States. O, no, Monsieur, not at all! France is now our friend through all eternity, for she gave us an unanswerable argument for never again going into a European war. That's the greatest gift since Lafayette. *Vive la France!*

That charming little village in Maine, built in connection with the abandonment of the crazy "Quoddy" project—we suggest that it be used as a sanitarium for the Washington "brain trusters" who conceive such schemes!

It used to be the "old men" who were carrying the world to ruin! But that isn't true any more! Hitler's recent birthday celebration reminds us that the Fuehrer is only 47 years old. Mussolini is 48, Stalin 56, and President Roosevelt 54. It's the young men who have got to take the blame or praise for whatever is going on these days.

J. H. H.

Renaissance on the Campus

W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW, II

When the Fabulous Twenties went out with a crash, that raccoon-coated, gin-swiggin' symbol of the era, Joe College, and his partner in whoopee, Betty Coed, passed on too.

As effectively as anything else they epitomized a nation gone economically, politically and socially haywire. Their passing, like that of the period they so effectively represented, occasioned no grief; only a sigh of relief and a hope that a new deal might somehow be at hand.

A new deal came to the nation. And, though a few of Joe's kin lingered on, a new deal came to the American campus. Students faced the Sober Thirties with a new attitude. An awakening interest in national and international affairs was seen. Something of a renaissance had occurred on the campus.

Joe was a bad boy, No one will deny that his pocket flask, fast motor cars, all-night parties and absolute oblivion to studies were foreign to any sort of higher education. He had almost as little conception of his purpose in college as his elders had of the economic world in which they lived.

Under Joe's post-war regime, the campus in this country sank to a new low as a reckonable educational factor in American life. The college—like the arts, like the theatre, like the nation itself—was pretty much a reflection of the decade which bore it. The social whirl made of readin', writin' and 'rithmetic a mere eddy. Freak courses in ad writing, beauty parlor management, modernistic design and child training shoved the classic curricula far off the map. A. B.'s and B. S.'s were granted for almost any sort of major the ingenious student cared to think up. And the colleges, all but a comparatively few, were knowing accomplices to the fact.

What has prompted the growing transition to a saner, more reasonable campus outlook is not quite clear. That it came in the wake of a major political change is obvious, and that it was student-generated also is apparent. Whatever the cause, however, the effect today is making itself known in a number of significant respects.

On December 28 and 29 in Columbus, Ohio, delegates from 113 schools met to form the American Student Union, a progressive coalition of student forces unparalleled in this country. Growing out of the recent merger of the Student League for Industrial Democracy and the National Student League, the unity convention represented the first full American alliance of liberal, progressive and left-wing forces on crucial issues confronting independent students and teachers.

"Because American students want peace; because they, like their forefathers, are devoted to the principles of freedom and equality; because they seek educational and economic security; and because present-day society is increasingly denying them these elementary necessities; American students in high schools and colleges have formed a powerful alliance, the American Student Union."

[Note: Joe College is the symbol or caricature of the typical college youth of the Twenties, and Betty Coed is his feminine counterpart.]

So read the preface to the five-plank convention platform, adopted unanimously.

Perusal of that platform is enlightening. Concisely, lucidly, logically the students expressed their aims and ideals. They stood "as a bulwark against those forces which would regiment American education and intellectual life to the sterility of culture under Fascism." So must the forefathers, of whom they proudly sang, have stood when they penned a curiously similar document, the "Declaration of Independence."

Of peace, the convention said:

"The American Student Union opposes militarism in education not only because it is and always has been a brutalizing force, but because it represents the preparations of the American government for entrance into another world war. . . . We accept without reservation the Oxford pledge 'to refuse to support any war conducted by the U. S. government.' "

Summing up the union's stand and its possible future, embattled students declare:

"The A. S. U. represents a step never before achieved in American life; a coalition of every progressive force against those interests which threaten to destroy us all. The union is independent of any political party; it proposes to unite students irrespective of political parties or religious faith, in defense of their lives and liberties. It offers them an instrument through which together they may strive to achieve a better and a more secure and fruitful life. These are tasks confronting all of us; these are aspirations which we share together. When our enemies are so closely aligned, so united in purpose, there can be no barrier to our collective effort. Without it we are doomed. Together we can advance to a new frontier, a future of peace and plenty for our generation and those to come."

There is another sign post, equally significant, pointing toward a renaissance on the American campus. That indicator is the growing interest in national and international news as evinced by the pages of the collegiate press. According to the report of delegates to the Associated Collegiate Press Convention held in Chicago recently:

"World news is pushing campus affairs far off the front page of college newspapers. . . . The college sheet is looking far past the campus. . . . Students are becoming more and more interested in the outside world, in questions of government, politics and war."

These findings coincide with the general verdict of professors throughout the country: that student interest, long dormant in American colleges, is at last awakening to the stimuli of a social, economic and political situation critical enough to arouse any intelligent person.

Here is a somewhat delayed answer to the oft-repeated charge that American college students have no conception of and no interest in affairs outside their own small campus orbit. True in the halcyon days of the Twenties, the statement is only partially valid today.

A number of the larger campus journals, not content with a mere re-hashing of other papers' news, have actually leased one of the three big wire services and run the same dispatches, conveniently condensed, as their big brothers, the metropolitan dailies.

The University of Chicago's *Daily Maroon* and the *Oberlin* (College) *Review*, for instance, now have full-fledged United Press wire service and devote a sizable portion of their front pages to wire copy. A poll taken recently at the former institution found the student body overwhelmingly in favor of continuing the service, inaugurated last fall.

Where the paper is too small or too impoverished to afford the luxury of a wire, student-written columns, à la Frank Sullivan, Lowell Thomas or Westbrook Pegler, take its place. These columns, their contents largely gleaned from other papers, satisfy a campus demand for news beyond the narrow confines of college grounds. And this new interest in national and international news is by no means confined to a few papers or localities; almost every college paper of any size in the United States today runs some general news each issue somewhere in its pages.

When the column grows tiresome, the enterprising editor is wont to interview a faculty member, student or campus visitor, familiar with some particular, pertinent subject, and present his opinion as a sort of second-hand news. In emulating their bigger brethren by running the personal opinion and comment of one or a few people as authoritative news, however, the collegiate press is laying itself open to the same danger of narrow and prejudiced news presentation as is afflicting the national press.

The prevalence of commentaries such as *Time,* the *Literary Digest* and *News-Week* on the campus gives further indication that the *College Humor* era is over. Lead magazine on the subscription list of most fraternity houses and dormitories is one of this triumvirate (usually *Time* because of the popularity of its style among college students).

The general assembly, long a bane of students in small colleges, is today finding a measure of favor among its student audiences. The key to this miracle is the scheduling of well-informed, interesting speakers who can discourse with authority for an hour on vital contemporary subjects. The speakers have always been available, and the college assembly has long been with us, but it took a self-generated interest on the part of the student body to put it over with any popularity.

Not unlike the assembly are the current events courses springing up among American campuses. These courses, which usually consist of one lecture a week, feature various faculty members or informed visitors who discuss all manner of current events and problems. Significant is the fact that though the courses are almost always elective, they are usually better attended than any others. (At Antioch College, a Trends of the Times course, given by the editor of the *Dayton News,* has won much campus popularity. Attraction of the weekly lectures fills the class room; many of the students attending are not even enrolled in the course; they come out of sheer interest in the subjects presented.)

Sometimes committees are formed to investigate more specifically a controversial subject, and these committees often end up by resolving into special study clubs. Sometimes they affiliate with the International Relations Club, a national group which is doing much to encourage study of world-wide relations on college campuses. Whatever their affiliations, the clubs do encourage a highly commendable sort of study and interest among the colleges.

Dawn of the campus renaissance is a most gratifying phenomenon on a horizon already clouded by threats of war, strikes and revolution. Should this student interest develop sufficiently, its potential influence and significance are incalculable. Rather than a renaissance, it might become a revolution, driving home the theories and ideals with which other liberal bodies have perforce ineffectually labored for many years. Certain it is that the re-awakening of student interest in world affairs on the college campus omens well for the future of the American plan.

Health Security and the American Public*

MICHAEL M. DAVIS

You people in this hall in New York, whether doctors, patients, or merely exhibits, you people in cities, towns, and farmhouses who are listening in, you know from the experience of your own families and neighbors about needs for medical care and the financial burdens brought by sickness bills. Does not every one of you know families to whom an unexpected sickness bill of $100, or $500, or more, brought financial distress? Does not every one of you know people who have waited for medical care until they were seriously ill, or who have gone without care because they did not feel they could pay for it and did not wish to seek charity?

Sickness bills are not like any other bills in the family budget. They fall unevenly. They fall unexpectedly. You can't plan for them in advance as you can plan your expenses for food, rent, or luxuries. You know this from experience. In brief statistics: about half the people in any given year have little sickness and very low sickness bills; about one-third have moderate sickness bills; whereas the remaining one-sixth have very high bills. This unlucky sixth of the people pays in one year half the total sickness bills paid by everybody in that year. And you cannot tell in advance whether your family, during the next year, will be in the lucky half, the moderately fortunate third, or the unlucky sixth.

Physicians' bills are only about one-third the total sickness costs. Bills from hospitals, dentists, nurses, drug stores, and miscellaneous healers make up the balance. Remember that the doctor has only a moderate share in the total costs of sickness.

Now, in proportion as people find it hard to pay sickness bills, so the incomes of doctors, dentists, hospitals, and nurses are unstable and insufficient. Even in 1929 only a few doctors had large incomes, and half the general practitioners had incomes of less than $2,500.

Before the depression, studies covering over 24,000 persons of moderate or small incomes showed that 25 to 30 per cent of these people had gone through a disabling illness—not a minor illness, mind you—without any care from a physician. Among the well-to-do, practically all these illnesses received care. Since the depression, the studies show unmet needs no less large. In California, the state which possesses the most physicians in proportion to population, over 33 per cent of the people, studied in 1934, with family incomes under $1,200, went through disabling sickness without any care. These unmet needs exist in spite of the fact that the great majority of physicians are willing to give service without pay when called upon to do so. But the physician does not seek the patient. The patient must seek the doctor, and people are kept from seeking the doctor by five reasons: ignorance, prejudice, lack of money, fear of debt, dislike of charity.

What shall be done to bring needed medical care to the people without financial distress and without the stigma of charity? It might be well to ask first, "What has been done?"

Charity has done something. Physicians have done a large share of medical charity by giving their services free. The well-to-do have done a good deal, chiefly by building and contributing to hospitals and clinics.

Recently some medical societies have been pushing the establishment of credit bureaus or fee adjustment bureaus. In Washington, D. C., for example, one has been running for over a year. A person may go to a central office to ask for a physician's care or dental or hospital service at reduced rates, and may arrange to pay in installments. This plan may help some persons, but requires people who are self-supporting while in health to apply at a public office when they are sick, and to be financially investigated and card-catalogued. I doubt whether many Americans will take to this sort of regimentation.

The principle of insurance applied to sickness has done already to this country more than charity ever can. It comes straight to grips with the financial risks of sickness which cannot be budgeted by any one family but which can be budgeted by a group. A thousand or ten thousand people or more, who pay from $1.50 to $3 per month, for instance, can have a common fund large enough to pay for needed medical care for every one of their number. About 1,500,000 employees and their dependents in certain industrial enterprises now pay for all or most of their medical care in this way. Some medical societies and private groups of physicians are actually offering such plans; others are now considering them.

Insurance for hospital bills alone has been growing rapidly during the last three years, at rates of from 50 to 80 cents per month. These hospital plans now exist in 60 cities on a cooperative, nonprofit basis, and cover some 300,000 people.

In some country districts the people have put their heads and their pocketbooks together and pay a doctor a salary or a guarantee so as to bring at least one well-trained physician to their neighborhood. I hope that the consumers' cooperatives which are now growing in the United States will turn their attention to the very fruitful field of cooperative purchase of medical care.

In almost all our states, the medical care needed for industrial accidents is paid for by insurance made compulsory by law under workmen's compensation acts. In most European countries sickness insurance is required by law for most of the employed population; it provides the financial basis of their general medical care, and has been successful enough to be steadily extended. In our more prosperous states, a compulsory sickness insurance law adapted to American conditions need not require people of modest incomes to pay more money than they are now accustomed to spend on the average. Last year a compulsory sickness in-

*From *America's Town Meeting of the Air—Number 19—Health Security and the American Public,* copyright 1936. Used by permission of American Book Company, publishers.

Dr. Davis is director of the Julius Rosenwald Medical Service Fund of Chicago.

surance law was seriously considered by the California legislature and was backed at that time by the state medical society.

In this country, however, taxation has been used much more than either charity or insurance to spread the burden of sickness costs. Tax expenditures for medical care are about five times those from either charity or sickness insurance. We are using tax funds, though in widely varying degrees in different localities, and insufficiently in almost all, to pay for the care of certain dangerous or costly diseases, such as tuberculosis, syphilis, mental disease, diseases and defects of children. About one-third of all the hospital patients with acute diseases are cared for in city, county, or state general hospitals, a certain number of these people being paying patients. We have made some beginnings in rendering laboratory and other expensive facilities for diagnosing disease available at public or charitable expense to people and to doctors who otherwise could not afford them.

During the depression, we have furnished tax-supported medical care to millions of people who were on relief. And here we have adopted the very important policy of paying the doctors.

We have done a real something for health security through hospitals and clinics, maintained in part by governments, in larger number by voluntary agencies. In sixty years, hospital beds have increased twelve times faster than population. In thirty years, clinics have grown still faster, serving sick people who are able to be up and about. The chief trouble about clinics has been that doctors have been expected to give them an increasing and now unreasonable amount of service without pay. Hospitals and clinics are becoming centers of medical practice, through which the rank and file of physicians, and the mass of patients, must gain access to the most modern resources for the study, diagnosis, and treatment of disease. The vital contributions of hospitals and clinics to service, education, and research have necessarily been accompanied by increased costs. These costs are now borne partly, and in future must be carried much more largely, by taxation or by insurance, in governmental or in voluntary hospitals.

One of the biggest steps toward health security is prevention, but we now spend $30 for care of disease to every $1 for preventing it. Medical science has made great strides in showing how to prevent or control disease. As a result the death rate has been lowered and life has been prolonged. But four-fifths of our country districts have as yet no organized public health services. Our city health departments average less than half the appropriations they ought to have. Appropriations of over ten million dollars for public health service and maternal and child health have just been made under the Social Security Act. These are reasons for national congratulation, but they are only a beginning.

I have said something about what has been done, and what hasn't. Now, what should be done? The problems of medical care are too complex to be solved by any one formula. There is no panacea. But there are ways ahead toward health security.

Health security for the American people means two things: financial security against the continuous economic risks and the occasional catastrophes due to sickness, and personal security against all that part of sickness itself which modern knowledge can now prevent or control. We have a first-rate medical profession and good hospitals. There are enough physicians and hospital beds in most localities, but not enough in many rural areas. A high quality of medical care is essential. No one wants poor medical service even if it is cheap. Everyone wants and has a right to have a doctor with whom he feels a personal relationship of confidence. Furnishing medical service is the responsibility which the medical and allied professions are trained for, whereas arranging for the payment of medical care is the responsibility which the public must assume.

We should move toward health security in five ways:

1. Expand preventive work under local, state, and national governments.

2. Use state and national tax funds for needy rural areas to supplement their local resources so far as necessary in order to provide their people with the medical and hospital care they need.

3. Extend present policies of tax-supported care for diseases which are dangerous to the public health, or which are especially costly to diagnose or treat; and for general medical and hospital care of people who are without means.

4. Develop plans of sickness insurance to enable self-supporting families to budget all or some of the burdensome sickness costs which still remain; organizing such plans either voluntarily or requiring them by law, according as conditions in various states and localities may indicate; and correlating them closely with public health, private practice, hospital and clinic services.

5. Ensure adequate representation of the professional groups in the voluntary and governmental agencies which work out plans for health security. Through such representation these groups should be assured fair conditions of service and of remuneration, and the public, in turn, can properly hold physicians and hospital administrators largely responsible for a more efficient and more economical organization of professional services and institutions.

There are many views on these questions. There are people for instance who push sickness insurance and others who push tax-supported medical care, each as a panacea. These groups should realize that neither one has a panacea but that both public medical services and sickness insurance are essential parts in a program of health security.

Some physicians and some medical organizations have opposed these plans of change, or expressed exceeding caution. I know that you will be told, probably tonight, that most of the plans I have outlined are very bad, would destroy American individualism, will lower the quality of medical care. You will be told the figures I have quoted are unsound or exaggerated. Now some doctors really believe this; other doctors, an increasing number of them, are actually progressive and are today in the forefront of study and action. Ways

of action are now becoming clear; and the American public, I believe, is now more ready than ever before to take the humane, practical, and necessary steps towards health security.

I cannot close without emphasizing that in health security we play for large stakes. Sickness causes untold suffering, anxiety, loss of happiness and of individual effectiveness. In normal times, it is the largest single cause of dependency. Besides the costs of caring for sickness, there is an estimated annual loss of about five billion dollars from lost wages and deaths due to diseases which can now be prevented or controlled. Not all of this could be saved, but a good deal might be. The rewards of health security will be both human happiness and public gain.

Peace Through Insurance

RAMSDEN BALMFORTH*

Every thoughtful observer of world affairs will agree that during the present and coming generation the various peoples of the world will be called upon to face alternatives and make decisions which will involve either the continuance of chaos and the possibility of anarchy, or intelligent and planned co-operation for the building of a better civilization. What Mr. H. G. Wells calls the "race between catastrophe and education" is now going on, and the odds seem to be on the side of catastrophe. For how can we educate, in any adequate sense, the millions of peasants in India, Japan, and China, and the millions of industrialists in the great cities of the West? Even the optimists and the meliorists begin to shake their heads, and the pessimists hold themselves justified in their pessimism and their cynicism.

Yet, in nearly every country in the world, save where the people are blinded by fanaticism or deluded by one-sided propaganda, there is a wholesome horror and hatred of war, and an intense desire for peace and a quiet life. It is on these healthier instincts that we, who believe in education and co-operation, have to rely in our appeal to reason and the common welfare, as against the most unscrupulous and murderous forms of force culminating in wholesale devastation and slaughter. There are some people who still glorify war, and who are prepared to contemplate murder from the skies, even of little children—so long as they are not their own children—with a shrug of indifference. Such people are a danger to civilization and should be interned in a mental hospital. That is the gulf that divides the war-makers and the peace-makers. We accuse each other of insanity. Is it possible to bridge that gulf?

It is not my intention here to enter, in detail, into the rights and wrongs of Italy and Abyssinia. Both have a case—a case which should be argued before an international tribunal. But I think I am justified in appealing from a nation at its worst—a nation blinded by false patriotism and deluded by a one-sided propaganda—to a nation at its best—appealing, that is, from Philip drunk to Philip sober. And the Italian I shall choose as representative of Philip sober is—Guiseppe, or Joseph Mazzini. Mazzini believed in the supreme value of the individual personality and in what it might become, and that the rightful claims of the individual could be reconciled with those of the community. He knew that Truth often resides in a minority, sometimes in a minority of one—and that that one, or minority, must be allowed freedom to voice its conception of Truth. He believed also in a rising and widening scale of loyalties—the loyalty of the individual to the community or city; the loyalty of the city to the State or the nation; the loyalty of the Nation to Humanity; and that where these loyalties conflict the deciding factor must be the welfare of the whole rather than the interests of a particular section, class, party, or nation. Some of Mazzini's sentences still sound like trumpet calls:

"Great principles alone are constructive."

"Association makes for unity, and it is unity, not disunity, the world wants."

"We seek the paths of heaven upon earth; for we know that this earth was given us for our workshop, and that by our earthly works we shall be judged."

"We cannot admit that instead of loving one another as brethren men ought to be divided, hostile, selfish, jealous, city of city, nation of nation."

"We are laboring that the development of human society may be, as far as possible, in the likeness of the Divine society."

"Men were first slaves, then serfs, now they are hirelings—the principle of association will make them free."

"All men are sons of God, children of the Spirit, therefore all men are brethren."

"In whatsoever land you live, let your words and your actions be for all men. . . . Wheresoever a man is tortured through error, injustice, or tyranny, that man is your brother. Free men and slaves, you are all brethren. . . . Say not, *Humanity is too vast, and we are too weak.* God does not judge the power, but the intention. Love Humanity. Ask yourselves, as to every act you commit within the circle of family or country: *If what I now do were done by and for all men, would it be beneficial or injurious to humanity?*"

But many of us have learned by experience that the world is not going to be converted by the repetition of texts such as "Little children love one another," or texts which emphasize the beauty of love as compared with the ugliness of hatred, or the duty of loving our neighbors as ourselves. We accept these truisms but we ignore or forget them. Even Jesus himself temporarily forgot his own teaching when his neighbor happened to be a hypocritical and narrow-minded Pharisee. We must love our neighbor, truly, but we need not love his vices. We have got to show the average man how the energies which go to waste, and worse than waste, in personal, national, and racial hatred may be transformed into more rational and fruitful activities. Can that be done? We can see how it has been done in history over and over again. Every time the narrower loyalty to the family, the tribe, the city, or the nation has given place to a larger loyalty, loyalty to a larger family or federation of families, tribes, cities, and nations, the narrower loyalty has died out, or has been transformed and enlarged into a love of, and a loyalty to, something greater and wider. How then can we substitute the wider love of humanity which Mazzini and others have taught, for the nar-

*Minister, the Free Protestant (Unitarian) Church, Cape Town, Africa.—EDITOR.

rower love which breathes in the mysticism of Mussolini and leads him to introduce the arts of destruction and death into his children's schools?

Here I must call to my aid the modern expounder of the philosophy of loyalty, namely, the late Dr. Josiah Royce, one time Professor of Moral Philosophy and Civic Polity at Harvard University and Gifford lecturer at Aberdeen in the year 1900. In the early days of the Great War Dr. Royce published an essay on "War and Insurance," an essay in which he applied his principle of the philosophy of loyalty to the problems of nationalism, internationalism, and the prevention of war. He showed how all the healthy loyalties of men culminate in what he calls loyalty to "the beloved community" of mankind—as taught by all the great teachers, from Confucius, Buddha, Jesus, St. Paul, and St. Francis, down to Mahatma Gandhi and our own poet Shelley. But he pleads that this loyalty shall be, not a mere wishy-washy sentiment, but a practical business proposition and arrangement guaranteeing the security and the well-being of life, *for all.* That was not possible in Royce's time, as he knew, but it is possible now, with a League of Nations already in being, and a still more representative League to come. A League which, to use Royce's words, will promote the growth of some higher type of loyalty, "which shall absorb the men of the future so that the service of the community of all mankind will at last become their great obsession, while this world-patriotism, when it comes, will remain still as active, and on occasion as businesslike in its plans and in its devotion as is now the love of warring patriots for their mutually hostile countries."

How is this to be accomplished? To say, as Royce said, that this great ethical and religious aim is to be accomplished by Insurance, sounds like an anti-climax. But it is not an anti-climax. It is stark and naked fact. Our very life here on earth, physical and mental, and the development of personality, and of society and civilization in all its varied forms, are dependent on our economic security and well-being. If that goes, everything goes. And what is Mutual Insurance in many of its forms but a method of ensuring that economic security and well-being? When you join an Insurance Company or Society you may not love your fellow-members. You may not even know many of them, and if you did you might not be able to get on with them. But all the same you enter into a contract with them to guarantee or ensure their economic security and well-being up to a point, on condition that, under the same or similar adverse circumstances, they will come to the help of you. That is, you are so far loving your neighbor-members as yourselves, and, in Pauline phrase, helping each other "to bear one another's burdens." That principle of Insurance is now, as you know, being applied in social and industrial matters in many ways, and Dr. Royce urges that it might be applied in circumstances arising out of such natural calamities as earthquakes and volcanic eruptions, pestilences, famines and crop failures, storms, floods, and marine disasters. But his main contention is that it might also be applied in war, that an International Insurance organization could insure its nation-members against many of the evils of actual war, and would directly tend to prevent war. One important condition would be necessary. That is that no aggressor nation should receive insurance compensation for any expenses due to a war in which it committed the first act of war. This rule would probably require judicial interpretation; or the question as to which nation was the aggressor might be decided by a substantial majority of the International Authority. But the effect would be that international co-operation would be promoted through Mutual Insurance against common dangers and disasters and evils, by the loyalty of each individual nation to the community of nations. We have seen during the last few months how necessary such an insurance is in regard to the losses incurred by some of the smaller nations owing to the imposition of sanctions. Where, it will be asked, is the money to come from to start an International Insurance Fund? Why, a mere ten per cent of the amount spent at present on armaments would soon furnish so large a sum that the International Authority would hardly know where to invest it. I need not labor the point that the enormously complicated economic and financial aspects of Mutual Insurance and Collective Security have been duly considered not only by philosophers like Dr. Royce, but also by actuarial and statistical experts who know their job, and that these various aspects will in future receive deeper study and consideration outside and above the atmosphere of party, class, racial, and national jealousies and maneuverings.

But can such a peace move be made within the framework of the Covenant of the League? Undoubtedly it can. Article XVI of the Covenant not only contemplates the possibility and the probability of mutual financial and economic measures of assistance among members of the League, but urges the adoption of such measures. And Article XXVI distinctly contemplates Amendments to the Covenant which "will take effect when ratified by the members of the League whose representatives compose the Council, and by a majority of the members of the League whose representatives compose the Assembly."

But who is to take the initiative towards this policy of collective security by Mutual Insurance? Is the League too weak, preferring to wait for outside support, or the support of the smaller nations? Then why should not South Africa take the initiative? General Smuts has great weight and influence among European statesmen, and if our Parliament could agree upon a formula he could go with a strong, if not a united, Parliamentary backing. At times like these, wise politicians will subordinate party interests to Humanity; that is, to the collective welfare of all the nations. Failing this, why should not the two Dictators in Europe—Herr Hitler and Signor Mussolini; the two Presidents of the two greatest Republics in the world—President Roosevelt and President Stalin; the Emperor of Japan,—as a lapsed member of the League; and the Emperor of Abyssinia,—as indirectly representing about one hundred million natives in Africa, urge the League to call a World Conference to consider this matter of collective security by Mutual Insurance? If Signor Mussolini were wise he would jump at such a proposal and immediately offer an Armistice, on condition that such a World Conference would consider the legitimate claims of Italy to territorial expansion and opportunities for colonial development. But other countries would then make similar claims? Of course they would, but all such claims would be conditioned by the policy of Mutual Insurance, which would lift the atmosphere of any Round Table Conference above the cloud of suspicion and distrust which at present hangs over international af-

fairs. We have got to face these questions. We cannot get away from them. And it is better to face them round a table than amid the suspicions and distrusts of a race in armaments, or the clamors and hatreds of widespread suicidal wars.

Failing these suggestions, we must fall back upon the peoples of all countries themselves. The number of such people desiring peace and a quiet life is legion. And the number of their peace societies and organizations is very great. I have time to mention only a few, such as the World-Fellowship of Faiths, Christian and non-Christian, which meets in Congress this year; the World Alliance of Churches, which has branches in thirty-seven countries; our own International Association for Liberal Christianity and Religious Freedom, which has affiliated groups in twenty countries; the Stockholm Religious Conference; the Universal Peace Congress; the International Council of Women and other Women's Organizations; the League of Nations Unions in all countries; the Youth Leagues; the Workers' Educational Association and the great Trade Unions; indeed every religious, ethical, theosophist and rationalist society or organization worth the name of ethical or religious—from the Servants of India to the Oxford Groupers—all, indeed, who appeal to reason and religion rather than to violence and racial animosities.

Especially would I appeal to the Fabian pioneers George Bernard Shaw and Mrs. Shaw, Sidney and Beatrice Webb, Edward R. Pease, and Lord Olivier. For some fifty years they have been engaged in a work, in the London Fabian Society, which has left its mark upon the economic and political history of our time. For close upon half a century I have been, more or less silently, associated with them so I know that my words will be listened to with respect if not with full agreement. Especially would I appeal to Bernard Shaw, for whose courage, single-mindedness, and clarity of mind I have a great admiration. In 1929 Shaw published, through the Fabian Society, a pamphlet in which he pleaded for the support and strengthening of the League of Nations, declaring that "the case for maintaining the League becomes irresistible, and the attempts to starve it disgracefully stupid," that "the serious statesmen of the big Powers know that they cannot do without it," and that "if there were no League, it would be necessary to invent one." Those words are as true today as when they were written. The League needs strengthening, and we must not allow the ramrod of Totalitarianism to jam its delicate machinery or to interfere with its international work and aims. Everyone knows that a great work like the establishment of an International Authority and the framing and development of a code of International Law takes time. Recalling, as I do, those splendid satires on militarism and war in *Major Barbara, Androcles and the Lion,* and the first part of *Back to Methuselah,* I cannot believe that Bernard Shaw is whole-heartedly sympathetic with Mussolini's militarist and war policy, or the introduction of militarism into the schools. Whenever I hear of the preparing and training of little children in the arts of killing and deceit, I am inclined to use the words of Shaw's "Eve," in relation to Cain's shameless and painted wife Lua, of whom future races of men "will say nothing; but when they think of her they will spit." So, too, when they read of the proposal to make schools the nurseries and training camps of potential perverters of the truth and slayers of men—"they will spit!"

Were I living in England now and taking an active part in the work of the Fabian Society, I would urge the Executive Committee of that Society to call a special meeting of members to discuss and clarify the issues and formulate a policy in accordance with the best traditions of Fabianism. One of those traditions has been that Fabianism rises above all sects and parties, and takes as much Socialism as it can get (which, to me, means applied Christianity, or, if the word Christianity is too ambiguous, applied religion) from any and every government, and then asks for more. So, too, in international affairs.

Humanity is at the Cross-Roads. We are at the beginning, only the beginning, of a new epoch. The peoples need a lead. It is necessary that we should be clear in our minds as to what policy we should pursue, and how we should pursue it—the building up of a new and better Commonwealth of mankind, or a blind and irregular advance through hatred and national and racial animosities—

"Where ignorant armies clash by night"—towards chaos and the dark.

Indelible Number

Peace time is a summer day,
  A fantasy, a napping;
But rhapsody may end in tears
  At the faintest tapping:
Handless arm against my door,
Wooden feet that clump the floor,

A broken man is asking work,
  "I hope I don't disturb,
For fifty cents I'd like to paint
  Your number on the curb?"
Under his arms, around his head
Scrouged the bleating maimed, the dead.

Bodies of Josef, of Jacques,
  And the pallid nun, Gretzel,
Oddly twisted in to
  A crumbling red pretzel;
Trapped in putrid scum
Beating heart for a drum.

Are you the lad we gaily cheered
  And herded off to battle,
You hangdog thing with furtive eye
  And voice that's just a rattle?
Black patch for a lucid eye,
Putty nose, shivered thigh!

"Paint my walk, just as you please,
  But know as you depart,
The awful number of gallant dead
  Is stenciled upon my heart."
Wake, awake from selfish napping,
Heed the veterans tap-tapping!

ANNE PENCE DAVIS.

A Program of Resettlement

HANS H. BAASCH

We of today are inclined to think of resettlement as a problem of our time only. However, the question of resettlement is as old as our country. Heretofore, it was an individual problem but now we realize that our resettlement problems no longer can be left to the individual to be solved, but must be met by cooperative effort on a national basis of social and economic planning.

We have had crises before similar to the one we are experiencing today. It is interesting to look back into one such some fifty years ago.

I can give you no better picture of the resettlement problem of that time than that described by Carl Hansen in his book entitled *Prairie Folk,* which deals with affairs of a small town in South Dakota. In his story he calls the town Hartland, and the quotations I give portray the revolt of the pioneers against an unkind nature.

"Well, what did you expect when you settled in this part of the country?" It was the town doctor who spoke as he stood among a group of families on Hartland Street.

"What did you expect on this roadless and unprotected prairie so far north? Did you imagine a kind of garden of Eden where summers were cool and winters mild; where rain always came at the right time and in the right quantity; where you had only to sow and harvest to become rich and live in glory and happiness?"

"We expected to live at least like human beings," said Hans Senbeck.

"Living like human beings is a very elastic proposition, Mr. Senbeck," replied the doctor. "There are primitive men in Africa who require no more than a hole in the ground and a belt around their waists. There are people in Europe and America who think they can't remain human in a house of less than twenty-seven rooms."

"It makes no difference what you say, Doctor, I only wish I were back in Detroit where I came from. There we had at least enough to live on and some to spare. In fact anything is better than this desert."

So we see that fifty years ago our pioneers were faced with a resettlement problem—a problem which arose because the land on which they had settled never was farm land in the true sense of the word.

Last summer I witnessed a modern parallel to this same story. I talked with my aunt who had lived all her life in Kansas and had never before wanted to move. Now at last she is ready to move. Dust storms have undermined her affection for the old home. In her own words, the old homestead is rapidly becoming a part of the desert-like prairie and will stay that way. She feels, as did the characters in Hansen's book, that the people in her community must resettle somewhere else if they are to enjoy an income large enough for a decent standard of living.

My aunt's condition is no different from that of thousands of other farm people who now must move because the land on which their parents settled was never suited for farming. If these people are not given help, they will be forced to ask for relief. We all know that people cannot, nor do they wish to, continue on relief. Therefore, something better must be offered.

In sizing up the rural relief problem we find that it is largely concentrated in areas having a large proportion of the population on non-agricultural land. We commonly think of the relief problem as an outgrowth of the post-war depression. But rural relief problems at least have roots which reach back almost to the beginning of America's discovery—roots of unwise land choice, mismanagement, and exploitation of the continent's soil resources.

Until the early years of this century, a natural resettlement took care of the problem to a large extent. There was plenty of new land and the settler had only to "move west" if his location was unsatisfactory. The new land is gone. The problem no longer can be solved by a natural resettlement. There is only one way to approach the problem of families stranded on poor land; give them an opportunity to settle on good land. One of the principal objectives of the Resettlement Administration is to help do just that.

The job is a mighty one. To learn the facts, the President of the United States in 1934 appointed the National Resources Board to make a survey and determine the principal problem areas. From the board's report we find there are 125 million acres of land in farms which should be retired from agricultural production. And the families from these farms should be assisted in resettling on good land.

To carry out the full recommendation of the board would be an expensive venture even though dividends eventually would be paid. However, a beginning can be made through demonstration projects. To this end, the Resettlement Administration has already secured options on about ten million acres of non-agricultural land. This land will be developed for grazing, reforestation, wild-life preservation, erosion control, and recreation.

Since the problem involves more than just relocation of farm families or changes in use of land, the Resettlement Administration program attacks the problem on five separate but closely related fronts.

First of all comes land utilization. In this region, which includes Missouri, Illinois, Iowa, Indiana, and Ohio, there are fifteen land use projects totaling close to 153,000 acres. Two of these, the Meramec Forest and University of Missouri Game Preserve and Arboretum, are located in Missouri. More economic use of the land than farming is the objective for each of the fifteen projects in the region.

Taking the land out of farming means that many families will need aid in relocating. Thus, rural resettlement comes into the picture. Under the rural resettlement program qualified families from the land-use areas as well as other poor land areas will be aided in settling on better farms. It is proposed to extend this aid through long-term loans and low interest rates. Ten resettlement areas have been tentatively located in the region.

A third phase of the program is rural rehabilitation. The objective of this phase is to help the farmer who needs credit and operating capital to continue farming. The aid is given through short-term loans and carefully thought-out farm and home management plans. Some eighty thousand families in this region are in need

of such aid. Already, thousands of them have been helped and are on the road back to self-sufficiency.

Farm Debt Adjustment is another phase of the Resettlement Administration program. It is handled under the rural rehabilitation division and seeks to help the thousands of farmers who contracted debts during the peak-price period and now are threatened with foreclosure and loss of property. Help is extended through farm debt adjustment supervisors and voluntary county debt adjustment committees. These groups cooperate to help farmers and creditors work out settlements based on the ability of the farmers to pay. Since September 1, 1935, nearly two thousand farmers in the five states have been aided through this program with a total saving to them of $3,231,021.

The fifth phase of the program is suburban housing. Here the goal is to help industrial and professional workers in the low income groups to become home owners. It is proposed to do this first by allowing families to buy the homes on long-time payment plans; and, second, to supply each family with land for a garden so that living expenses may be reduced.

These five objectives will be attained because plans are being made to meet a definite and urgent need for a sound relationship between us, as a people, and our country's natural resources.

There is a mystic relationship between man and soil, one which we cannot ignore. It is a relationship of love between man and earth. A wise man once said, "If you sever the relationship between man's soul and the soul of the earth, man ceases to be a creative being." Is not that exactly what has happened to thousands of our farm families?

The Resettlement Administration and its program will help both our rural and urban people to realize that this relationship must be more than just economically sound. It must be such that it will enable us to work with the land and not against it.

Nature and the earth follow laws which we cannot alter. But we can adapt ourselves to those laws and thus increase human happiness here in our country. The Resettlement Administration is working out a program which, with your cooperation, will fulfil this purpose.

Death Comes for the Child*

DON WEST

"Shore, stranger, ef ye kin put up with pore folks' ways, ye'er welcome," the man said. I had grabbed at this hospitable offer. It had been a slushy trail up Ripshin. Mixture of mud and snow made tramping anything but pleasant.

The thaw on the south sides had swollen the Ripshin to river size. Two or three times I had to wade knee deep. There were no bridges or foot-logs. Once I had tried to vault it with an old fence rail, but the thing broke. About halfway I splashed on all fours into the icy waters of Ripshin Creek.

As I came out on the headwaters, dusk was just settling through the trees. Tomorrow was the meeting in the Gap. It was thirteen miles further, or, according to my last director—a lanky youth chopping firewood by the trail—"only a whoop an' a holler across Lickskillet." But at that time I did not feel like "whooping" or "hollering" either. I looked for a light from some house. I would ask to spend the night.

The house stood close by the branch at the mouth of Hoot Owl Holler. Wet and cold and tired, as I saw the light from its single window, it seemed like a beacon must seem to a lost seaman. It was just a single-roomed cabin, a "picturesque" mountaineer cabin. One like the fat-bellied old women (or men) rave about. Outside, the cracks were chinked with mud in the typical mountain style. Inside, the walls were pasted with old newspapers or cardboard.

There were two beds with straw ticks, an old stove, a home-made table, an oven and a fireplace.

"Pore folks has pore ways—" he began.

"An' rich'uns has mean'uns," I finished.

"Yeah, they gits rich that way, I reckon. But we's glad to spare shelter an' grub. Only thing is now we's got a turruble sick young'un. Ye'll have to make it on a pallet."

The little girl was twelve. She lay covered with coats and toe-sacks on one of the beds. She coughed constantly, a deep wracking cough that instantly gave a very unpleasant rasp to the nerves. Each cough was a half groan of agony. She would strain to keep it back, only to go into a spasm of coughing and retching.

"Got a turruble bad cold," the mother said. She wore a haggard look on her face and hovered close by the bedside. The five other children scrambled around the hearth, or put themselves in one of the four corners.

I did not wonder how they intended to keep me, with two beds, no cover, and eight of themselves. It was not a new experience to me. I remembered how my own mother had always found room for visitors when we had nine in the family and a similar one-room cabin.

The little girl continued to cough. The moon rode high above the timber on Lickskillet. I watched it climb from one crack to another as I lay there by the fire trying to sleep. Outside the hoot owls hushed their noise. The green wood simmered and the fire burned low. The moon reached the last crack, clambered across the roof and down behind Ripshin Mountain. Everything was dark. The little girl continued to cough and groan.

We had given her hot rattle-weed tea. We had put a hot poultice of dried chestnut leaves on her chest. But with each spell of coughing her breathing had become more difficult. She suffered mightily.

I lay there on the pallet hoping she would get better, hoping the cough would stop. Half asleep, I would be jarred back, ears split with that terrible sound. It was worse than being beaten by gun thugs. After each spell I would wait in suspense with nerves on edge. I think when one is worn out, tired and sleepy, the nerves must be like a bunch of frazzled yarn. Anyhow, I was over-sensitive to the child's suffering. I felt certain that I'd stumbled into that poverty-ridden cabin about the same time death had. I thought maybe we had both come here for lodging that night. For, inexperienced as I am in diseases, I was certain the child had a bad

*The author of this true sketch is a poet of the South, who first started the log libraries in Virginia and Georgia. Arrested in strike difficulties, he is now a fugitive from so-called justice in two states. He writes of what he has seen and known.—Editor.

case of pneumonia. She had had no skilled treatment. The nearest doctor was seventeen miles away. Besides, there was no money. Doctors must be paid money.

It was just about the time chickens begin to crow. Daybreak was streaking down the Ripshin when death left with the little girl.

I have never seen many people die. Perhaps all such deaths are terrible. I know that one was. The poor child must have been two hours at it. She strangled and gasped. We would think her gone. Then she would groan and try to get breath again. She would try to say something. The child was afraid, I think. She knew she was dying. And she wanted to live!

We were all awake. The mother wept over the dead body. The other children leaned on the bed or whimpered in a corner. The father sat there gazing at the fire with a stoic's face. As usual in such cases, I was not much good. I have never been able to say anything much at such times. Trying to speak words of cheer is so silly.

But, when this story is printed, I want an extra copy. I want to send it to that father and mother. I want them to paste it over the fire-board on top of the other newspapers. I want it to remind them that their little girl was murdered by a cruel social system which must be destroyed.

You, father and mother, I lodged with you one night, the same night death lodged in your humble cabin. I walked with you to the orchard where we dug the small grave and laid the body down inside the coffin we made with our own hands from pine planks out of the loft of your cabin. We did not say much then. We were all sorrowful. But I wanted to say there was great hope. There are the other five children. There is a future of hope, of hospitals, of doctors, of jobs and plenty. A future that holds more living than those few dead blossoms on the little grave in the orchard above the barn. That future we must build. It is for the other five, and the millions of other fives all over America!

The Study Table

Is This the Way Out?

SWEDEN, THE MIDDLE WAY. *By Marquis W. Childs. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press. 171 pp. $2.50.*

What a thrilling afternoon or evening awaits you, dear reader, when you can get your hands on Marquis W. Childs' *Sweden, the Middle Way!* In Sweden, the people are not talking about Communism, Socialism, Technocracy, Utopianism, Share-the-Wealth Clubs, Townsend plans, "New Deals," or anything of the kind. These Swedes are daily solving their economic problems through the cooperative principles. It is truly "A Middle Way." They are steering between the Scylla of Collectivism and the Charybdis of "rugged individualism," for the good of most all their citizens. Only 43,000 unemployed last August, less than one per cent of Sweden's population! Illiteracy is less than one tenth of one per cent! They have definitely stopped the seeming determination of capitalism in most countries to kill the goose that lays the golden egg. Both extreme personal wealth and poverty are virtually destroyed.

The Cooperatives have had to fight the capitalists all the way, in the newspapers, the courts, "wherever the issue could be raised." "Cooperation is the spearhead of socialism . . . the conservatives cry." (p. 22.) But the Kooperativa Forbundet (usually called K. F.) does not allow itself to be fooled by such outcries. It is determined to get the good things of life that machines can produce for all the peple. It has succeeded by democratic means in beating the capitalists at their own game. "When one says capitalist in Sweden, it is to refer really to one family, to one man at the head of that family, old Knut Wallenberg." (p. 23.) Yet, as Minister of Foreign Affairs for Sweden from 1914 to 1917, this capitalist, despite the queen's pro-German influence, kept Sweden neutral. By contrast, compare J. P. Morgan's influence in taking America into that holocaust!

One wishes that, for those of you who may never get the chance to read this vital volume, space were available to give something of the wealth of detail of the Cooperatives' fight for the consumers, farmers, the poor. New and modern homes for the poor with only $800 or less income a year! Great men, these leaders like Albin Johansson, Hedberg, Markelius, Wallender, Premier Per Albin Hansson; for the Swedish Cooperatives have not hesitated to take over and have the people (all of them) own through their government such necessities as electric power (they beat us long ago to our T. V. A.), radio (think of what heaven it must be in Sweden to have no advertising over the radio), telephones, telegraphy, transportation, the lumber industry, mining, liquor and tobacco. "But what about the liberty of individual initiative?" the conservatives demanded. "Yes," Wigforss answered, "you are all free now to become millionaires. How much do you want for that freedom? Would you not rather have a little more security?" (p. 95.) The Swedes prefer the security that their system, part cooperative, part government ownership and control, and part private capital gives to them. Only last June K. F. acquired control of one of Stockholm's two department stores. They have got hold of "a brake to halt the excesses of capitalism." (p. 50.)

Yet "the state monopolies . . . represent more nearly a compromise between private and public ownership . . . that . . . unites the virtues of individual initiative and collective self-interest." (p. 89.) One may "rise," as the word goes, in salary and importance, according to one's abilities; and, yet, there is work for all who are able to work. Even King Gustav V has graciously acceded and lives modestly as befits the monarch of those who have learned how to produce the good things of life for use rather than for profit. His abode "is an appropriate home for the hard working ruler of a democracy which is governed from the Left." (p. 117.) The Social-Democrats are in power. Their premier, Per Albin Hansson, lives modestly and simply not for show or to appeal to the people, but because he would choose to live that way under any circumstances. Yet, the Swedes are not for firing the capitalists out. They know that we must all learn somehow or other to live together, if we are not going to destroy one another by our crazy competitions, no longer excusable. What a slogan is that of the Social-Democrats! We wish one of our so-called major parties here in America would adopt it, quit stalling, and get busy try-

ing to realize it for all of us! Translated it is: *The same possibilities for living securely within the Fatherland for all those who inhabit it.* Perhaps Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln and others might recognize this as much nearer the ideals for which they lived and died than a lot of the cheap clap-trap the politicians of our day parade for moronic consumption.

Space prevents telling of the sensational disclosures of the megalomaniac, Kreuger, his connections with the J. P. Morgan firm; the General Electric Company of America's unsuccessful attempt to stop the Cooperatives making their own electric light bulbs; the U. S. National Cash Register Company's defeat together with Krupp of Germany, when they tried to ruin the cooperatives and stop them from making and selling a cash register for about half the price; the way in which these pragmatic Swedes made the "depression to serve them," simply because they are tied to no dogma, capitalistic or communistic. And the business index in November 1934 stood at 104, when 100 represents the 1929 level.

For one glorious thrill of what men have done, and are still doing, to solve the problems that are identical to the ones facing us, you must get the book. No wonder Lewis Gannett writes, "When Al Smith goes for his walk next Summer, he might well take it in Sweden . . . he might abandon the shrill Hearstian cry that America must choose between Washington and Moscow and begin talking sensibly about the way of Stockholm."

GEORGE MAYCHIN STOCKDALE.

America and Europe

BORAH OF IDAHO. *By Claudius O. Johnson. New York: Longmans, Green & Company. 511 pp. $3.00.*
INSIDE EUROPE. *By John Gunther. New York: Harper Brothers. 470 pp.*

Because depression and unemployment problems have forced the people to think about their economic security, the American public is more concerned with internal affairs than with world politics, Furthermore, this is a presidential election year and therefore the American public is discussing presidential candidates who may be able to lead the country out of its economic chaos. So far as the Democratic party is concerned it seems certain that President Franklin D. Roosevelt will be its standard-bearer; and there are indications that unless the Republicans can nominate a really progressive candidate who will enjoy the confidence of the masses of America and act as a true patriot, serving the people of the United States and not the vested interests, there is very little chance for the Republicans to defeat Mr. Roosevelt in the coming November election.

At the present time we hear of three or four Republican candidates—Governor Landon of Kansas, the choice of the conservative Republicans and reactionaries (such as Mr. William Randolph Hearst); Colonel Knox, a conservative; Senator Borah of Idaho, a nationally known progressive Republican; and Senator Vandenberg of Michigan, who may be a "dark horse" and a possible compromise candidate. Senator Borah is regarded by many as the only Republican who may be able to defeat Mr. Roosevelt, because the Idaho Senator has a record of more than thirty years which stamps him as a progressive thinker. In the book *Borah of Idaho,* Professor Johnson has given us an interesting biography of one of the most colorful figures of American politics of our present day.

The author devotes about fifty pages to the evolution of Borah as a man, lawyer, politician, and progressive statesman. Then he gives an account of Borah's ideas regarding various questions of national importance—such as capital and labor, states rights—conservation, tariff, anti-trust laws—and the problems of international relations—such as America's entry into the World War, America's attitude toward the League of Nations, America's relations with Mexico and other Latin American states, the recognition of Soviet Russia, and other questions.

The author summarizes the character of the Idaho statesman as a man of conscience who feels for the people and cannot be bought by vested interests. He is not a so-called "isolationist" regarding America's relations with the rest of the world. He simply opposes all measures by which the imperialist nations of Europe wish to use the United States to serve their interests against the genuine interests of America. Borah's sympathy is for the under-dog, and he is an anti-imperialist. He believes in peace and arbitration; but he is not an advocate of pawning American independence of action at the counter of the League of Nations, which is an international diplomatic machine to serve imperialist nations, or the League's World Court. Senator Borah is a consistent Republican and he even supported Mr. Hoover for his first presidential candidacy; but he became opposed to Mr. Hoover because of his reactionary policies. Senator Borah is opposing vigorously some of the New Deal measures, not because the ideal behind them is not progressive but because he is opposed to New Deal methods. Borah, although a Republican, has defended President Roosevelt in his various measures, especially the devaluation of the dollar.

The author thinks that Senator Borah is possibly the most outstanding Republican leader since the days of Theodore Roosevelt, and has the ability of influencing public opinion. Whether Senator Borah is nominated as a Republican candidate for the Presidency of the United States or not, none can deny the unique position enjoyed by the Idaho Senator as an independent American statesman. For this reason alone, the life of Borah is a distinct contribution to the study of American politics and should be read by all politically awakened American citizens.

The international situation in Europe is no less critical today than it was in 1914 before the outbreak of the World War. This was the gist of a declaration of the Rt. Hon. Anthony Eden, the British Foreign Secretary before the House of Commons a few weeks ago. If a war breaks out, due to Franco-German hostility in the Rhineland or Anglo-Italian rivalry in the Mediterranean, or Russo-German conflict in Central Europe or Russo-Japanese dispute on the frontier question between Manchukuo and Mongolia, it may become a world war, and the United States, in spite of her efforts to keep from being entangled in a foreign war, may be involved in it. Therefore what happens in Europe is of vital concern to the Amerian people.

What is happening in Europe is not the result of mere blind economic forces as many so-called radical historians wish us to believe. Neither is it the handiwork of a few men—supposed to be invisible rulers. Individual statesmen play their part in the drama of world politics; and the role of personal element is by no means insignificant, altho often overlooked. To be concrete, the present Anglo-Italian dispute on the issue of the Italo-Ethiopian War is not determined by

Britain's love for the poor Ethiopians. The British who starved thousands of Boer women and children (white people) in concentration camps, bombed Indian nationalists and the frontier tribesmen mercilessly, and violated her promises to the Egyptian people, have not suddenly become upholders of Ethiopian freedom for the sake of abstract justice and freedom. Britain's attitude, as Senator Borah pointed out in his famous speech, delivered on Washington's birthday (February 22, 1936), has been determined primarily, if not solely, by the desire to protect her imperial interests in Africa and guard her supremacy in the Mediterranean which is being challenged by Italy. But British statesmen of the type of Sir Samuel Hoare were willing to settle the dispute by cooperating with M. Laval of France, and pursuing a different method from that adopted by Mr. Eden. Mr. Eden's policy, his prejudices against Signor Mussolini, and the latter's violent reaction against the policy of those British statesmen (particularly Mr. Eden) in trying to ignore him, have embittered Anglo-Italian relations. Let us take another example: France and Great Britain are the foremost democratic nations of Europe and they have common interests in various problems of international politics which were really the foundation of the Locarno Pact; yet today while the British nation as a whole is opposed to Naziism and Herr Hitler, Britain has indirectly taken the side of Germany against France. In the final analysis, we find that some influential persons of the British banking world have used their influence to mould British foreign policy into pro-German shape. Here again comes the influence of "personality" in shaping historical forces or the influence of "psychological factors" (including propaganda carried on by powerful individuals and their party machinery) in shaping international relations.

Mr. Gunther, a distinguished American journalist of great experience and international reputation, in his book *Inside Europe* has emphasized the influence of the personal element in politics of all the important nations of Europe. He has drawn delicate, short yet comprehensive pictures of various dictators—Mussolini, Stalin, Hitler, Mustapha Kemal Ata-turk, and other lesser ones—and all the important statesmen of other lands and their politics, as influenced by their ideals and ambitious schemes. The book has a distinct value for the Americans who wish to familiarize themselves with the human forces behind the drama of European politics, the most important factor in the world situation. It is a matter of satisfaction that Mr. Gunther's work has already received recognition, by the intelligent American public, as one of the non-fiction best-sellers. The author has given an excellent, short but authoritative bibliography of works which may be of great value to those who wish to carry on extended study of the present trend of European politics.

TARAKNATH DAS.

An Arabian Night's Entertainment

SEVEN PILLARS OF WISDOM. By T. E. Lawrence. *Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday, Doran and Company. 672 pp.*

If for no other reason than its great length—280,000 words, 672 pages—the *Seven Pillars of Wisdom* is a difficult book to analyze. The historian, the sociologist, the psychologist, the military tactician—all these can find in it the materials for an intimate study; and there is enough of adventure, hard riding and hair-breadth escapes for the romantically-minded rank and file. There are passages, whole pages of sheer poetry to which conventional verse and meter could add nothing in beauty. And behind it all looms the mystic, mad genius of Lawrence himself pulling the strings like a puppeteer on one of the strangest dramas of the war.

Briefly told, it is a record of the Arab revolt during the years of 1917 and 1918 and the part Lawrence took in organizing the tribes for mutual resistance to the Turks, suppressing their inter-tribal feuds, cooperating with the British Army's efforts under Allenby—a cooperation made possible only through promises of Arab autonomy after victory . . . promises not made too altruistically and, like many promises made under press of war, never intended to be kept. "I exploited their highest ideals and made their love of freedom one more tool to help England win." "They were our dupes, wholeheartedly fighting the enemy. They blew before our intentions like chaff, being not chaff, but the bravest, simplest and merriest of men."

Lawrence was conscious of his own part in this betrayal of Arab trust; and in the silence of the long night marches or in the tumult of the fighting he would search his soul and see his moral decay. "Here were the Arabs believing me," he writes, "Allenby and Clayton trusting me, my bodyguard dying for me: and I began to wonder if all established reputations were founded, like mine, on fraud." And again: "And for honor, had I not lost that a year ago when I assured the Arabs that England kept her plighted word?" Time after time he was tempted to toss aside the whole deception before the ultimate degradation; and it is probably because of it that, after the victorious armies marched into Damascus, he sought obscurity as plain Aircraftsman Shaw in the Royal Air Force.

There are a few incongruities, not in the book itself, but in the aura of mystery about it. Why was general publication suppressed until after Lawrence's death? Why were only ten volumes of the edition, published in 1927 by The George H. Doran Company, to insure American copyright, "offered for sale at a price high enough to prevent their ever being sold"? Why so much consternation when the original MS. was lost at Reading Station in 1919? There is nothing libelous in the 672 pages—only a few mildly derogatory statements about the incompetence of certain English officers; and as for England's failure to keep her "plighted word"—was not that common knowledge even before the publication of *Revolt in the Desert?* Connected with anyone but Lawrence, this would smack of good press agentry emanating from a publisher's sales office. Or have the controversial accounts been deleted from the final edition? Rather let us believe that it was Lawrence's sensitivity about having participated in such a wholesale deception, the truth about which, though it must be told, might better be told after his death.

LYLE CORS.

In Ethiopia

White against black and black against white!
Monsters of torture crash through the night!
Loose are the hounds of a thousand hells,
Crumbled are holy citadels.

The life of a child is crushed like a flower,
The moon is a ghost on a lonely tower.
On walls of history this ghastly chart
When the brain has outstripped the human heart!

LUCIA TRENT.

Correspondence

Reply to AAA Editorial

Editor of UNITY:

I have just been reading your comments in the February 3rd, 1936, issue of UNITY on the AAA decision of the Supreme Court.

In justice to yourself, I wish you would study the facts so that you could determine in your own mind the actual relationship between the fact that there are "millions of people who are unemployed, without income, hungry, cold and miserable" and the matter of control of agricultural production.

I have studied this relationship and I have come to the conclusion that the production of foods beyond the amount that can be purchased in no way lessens the distress of the people who are unemployed, without income, and are hungry, cold and miserable. I think that the facts show that the production of agricultural commodities beyond the quantities that can be purchased intensify unemployment and hunger, and that one of the partial solutions of unemployment and hungry people is to establish a balance between the production of agricultural commodities and the amount that can be consumed.

I think you must hold the viewpoint, and without thinking the matter to its ultimate conclusion, that somehow or other, with a more than abundant production of foods, there is a better chance for poor people to secure food than there would be if an under-supply were produced. Of course, this in itself is true, but what you have failed to take into consideration is that the desirable situation is a balance between production and consumption, and that production of too much is just as destructive to society as not producing enough.

It therefore follows that if you have any moral indignation against the AAA, it should be directed against the technique of the AAA and not against the theory. If you arrive at this conclusion, your indictment that the AAA is immoral falls flat.

I think if you proceed a little further in your thinking and really examine the facts, and possibly by reading the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and by thoroughly acquainting yourself with the philosophy back of the Act, and by examining the technique used, that you will come to the conclusion that there was nothing done under the AAA which would lead to a curtailment of the production of foods or agricultural commodities which would have created or did create a condition of scarcity.

I think you will find the facts are that all the AAA did was to make a practical attempt to eliminate that quantity of agricultural commodities which, under the existing economic conditions, could not be purchased; that no attempt was ever made to create a scarcity, and that, factually, no scarcity was created.

There has been a lot of talk by paid propagandists, by men who had political axes to grind and by people who judged this very important part of our economy emotionally, that the AAA was a deliberate attempt to produce agricultural commodities in scarcity quantities. Any sober study of the facts denies the truth of these conclusions.

There isn't a great deal of difference between your fundamental conceptions of the relation of man to man and mine, and I am sure that we see eye to eye in most of the things in which we are both interested. In this matter of agricultural control, I think the difference between us is that I have studied the situation and have arrived at conclusions that are based on fact. I think that you have not studied the agricultural situation, particularly the relationship between the agricultural group and the rest of society and that you therefore have arrived at conclusions which you would not hold if you gave the matter the serious attention that it needs and must have, if it is to be understood.

If the matter could rest at this point, there would not be a great deal of harm done but when you, in your position, stigmatize agricultural control as being immoral, you are doing a great deal of harm and adding materially to the present economic maladjustment that is so distressing to all of us.

It seems to me that you men who are leaders of thought have got to specialize in some of these problems so that you know what you are talking about before you create emotional opinions and oppositions to really constructive measures.

Mr. Holmes, I am saying this in all sincerity and humility and I hope you will take it in the spirit in which I am offering it. I do a great deal of reading, I keep my mind as open as possible, and I am becoming more and more conscious that a whole lot of our difficulties arise from the fact that spiritual and intellectual leaders, through ignorance, oftentimes do as much harm as good. I know that it is asking a great deal for a man like you to make a competent study of the agricultural problem, but it is impossible for me to understand how you are justified in taking the dogmatic attitude that you do until you have thoroughly thought out the problem; and I also feel that, until you do have the facts, you ought to temper your statements accordingly.

I have said what I have herein because I am definitely sure that if you and I could have sat down for a three-hour talk we would have terminated the discussion in agreement, and you would not have written the editorial "Immoral Is Illegal."

Assuring you of my sympathetic attitude and sincere admiration for your attitude towards all things, and hoping that you will realize the spirit in which this letter is written, I am

H. G. ZUCKERMAN.

Berkeley, California.

[One phrase used by Mr. Zuckerman in his letter, "under the existing economic conditions," explains the difference between us. Mr. Zuckerman makes perfectly plain that, under these conditions, over-production is a disaster and therefore that the government must seek to establish a balance between production and consumption. But there is no over-production in this country, on the farms or anywhere else, in terms of human need! Millions of people are starving or semi-starving at the very moment that the government is paying millions of dollars to cut down the production of food. There is perhaps nothing else to do "under the existing economic conditions," just as Mr. Zuckerman points out, but it is this fact which I insist is immoral. The whole system itself is immoral! What the government has been doing is to create scarcity in order to raise prices and therefore guarantee private profits, and to do this the government has been willing to perpetuate the poverty and misery of millions of consumers. I de-

nounce the whole thing as an abomination under the law. A true AAA, dedicated not to profits but to the service of human need, would have dedicated itself to increasing production and then distributing the product to the millions who could consume it. The attempt to balance production and consumption, in other words, should have been up in the interest of adequate consumption rather than *down* in the interest of profitable production. The whole theory and practice of a scarcity economy is immoral, and every part and parcel of it is immoral. That's the reason why I have called the AAA a sin (immoral) and now rejoice that by the action of the Supreme Court it has been made a crime (illegal).—J. H. H.]

How Can This Country Stay Out of War?

Editor of UNITY:

How can this country stay out of war? Very simply; by fulfilling the destiny willed for her by God and dictated alike by history and geography.

The discovery of this country marked the emergence of a New World. Soon it became a haven of refuge for idealists and non-conformists, political as well as religious, seeking opportunity and liberty of conscience. By dint of perseverance, under God's guidance, the pioneers converted the wilderness into a veritable paradise on earth.

With the birth of this nation the pattern of destiny becomes clearer. Conceived in liberty, dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal, founded upon the principle that sovereignty resides in the people, this nation was born to proclaim to the world the principle of "no taxation without representation" and the ideals of democracy and self-determination.

The Monroe Doctrine reinforced the right of self-determination for the Americas and effectively checked European interference in the New World. Uncle Sam thus became the good Samaritan to his neighbors. The "good neighbor" policy at home spelt the end of slavery.

Democracy, equality of all before the law, special opportunities for the underprivileged, allegiance to the principle of self-determination for all, freedom of the seas, "the moral equivalent for war" (William James), the outlawry of war (Levinson-Borah, Kellogg-Briand), "non-recognition of territory acquired by force" (Stimson-F. D. R.)—such is the heritage of America. From it we can easily fashion a policy that shall keep this country out of war—and mayhap point the way to warlessness to the world.

The United States should today consciously take the lead in cultivating intensive neighborliness among all the American nations. A vitalized Pan-American Union with the Monroe Doctrine reinterpreted as the joint concern of all Americas, strengthening their intellectual, cultural, political, and economic bonds, would be the surest guaranty for keeping this country out of war.

With malice toward none, with charity for all, let the vitalized Pan-American Union strive toward economic self-sufficiency by reciprocity and goodwill. In peace times, every American nation may trade with any nation whatsoever, guided solely by the principle of increased wealth for its citizens. But in war times, the Pan-American Union should immediately enforce neutrality and the prohibition of trade with belligerents. Neither the United States nor the Pan-American Union should *officially* abrogate the freedom of the seas nor the right to trade without let or hindrance but the citizens of all the Americans should be plainly warned that in war time they carry on trade even with non-belligerents in war-affected areas at their own risk.

A self-sufficient Pan-America would not feel the pinch if all intercourse with the outside world were (voluntarily) cut off during war. Indeed, such a policy would have a sobering effect upon the habitual war-makers and imperialists of Europe and Asia who would have to forego Pan-American credits, munitions, raw materials, foodstuffs and other "implements" of war.

President Roosevelt's bid for an All-American Peace Parley is most timely. Let it strive to carry out the policy sketched herein. Meanwhile, comprehensive neutrality legislation, prohibiting trade with belligerents during war, should keep the United States out of war.

HARIDAS T. MUZUMDAR.

New York City.

The Field

(Continued from page 82)

products, fight against speculation, creation of a national grain bureau, support of farm co-operatives, removing the harsh tax laws, and revision of the emergency decrees which are reducing consuming capacity.

The financial reforms include regulation of the balance sheets of the banks and joint stock companies, transformation of the Bank of France into a real national bank and control of this new bank by government representatives and labor, deposit insurance for small savings accounts, and guarantees for bondholders. There are further provisions for taxing large incomes, eliminating waste and inefficiency in government, and preventing the export of capital.

It will be obvious at once that this program is vague and reformist, and not at all revolutionary. It has come under severe criticism for that very reason. Radicals have called for more drastic plans and have pointed out the inadequacy of the reforms contemplated.

Pacifists, too, find many things not to their liking. They regret the absence of a daring policy of general disarmament and the failure to demand a complete change in international politics. They also consider the handling of the very serious colonial problem as evasive, because parliamentary inquiry commissions usually only postpone an issue.

All of these shortcomings are readily admitted But it is hoped that once power has been attained at the elections the whole situation will be changed. The French masses, especially in the provinces, are rapidly losing patience and will certainly urge their leaders to go far beyond the program as it stands at present. Interesting historical parallels are adduced in support of this contention. The Estates General of 1789 was very moderate in its demands, but the Revolution brought about much more drastic changes.

So much seems certain: the real test of the Front Populaire still lies in the future. What will happen if the elections are won? Will the "united front" hold and will it adhere to its present moderate program? Will the alliance of these diverse groups be breached by

serious defections? Or will the drive of the suffering and discontented masses produce more thorough-going changes?

World Events.

A Belligerent Cardinal

The Italian newspaper, *Corriere della Sera,* reports the celebration of the 13th anniversary of the March on Rome in the Cathedral of Milan and the speech made on that occasion by Cardinal Schuster. Said the high dignitary:

"We who are part of the historic Italian drama can hardly have an appreciation of the importance of this date which opened a new chapter in the history of this peninsula, as well as in the history of the Catholic Church in Italy.

"With God, let us have faith in the national and Catholic mission, particularly since at this moment, on the battlefields of Ethiopia, the Italian flag is carrying to triumph the cross of Christ; breaking the chains of the slaves, and leveling the path of missionaries of the Gospel.

"Peace to the dead who died in doing their duty, in the faith and by the grace of Jesus Christ. Peace and protection to the valiant army, which in unquestioning obedience to the command of the country and at the price of its blood, is opening the gates of Ethiopia to the Catholic faith and to Roman civilization . . . For according to the eternal mission of Catholic Italy and Dante's Rome, where Rome is, there is also Christ."

Thereupon the Cardinal blessed the battle flags and machine guns of the Blackshirts and sent them "on their mission." Meanwhile the Pope issues one pronouncement after the other from the Vatican declaring that "we affirm solemnly again that we appeal to all men of good will, wherever they may be, that peace inseparable from justice, from truth, and from love, be their warmest desire. It is peace which with all our power we will endeavor to establish."

—*Nofrontier News Service.*

Mr. Roosevelt's 3-Years' Work

Dr. Harry Elmer Barnes

It is three years ago since Franklin D. Roosevelt took the oath of office as President of the United States and promised the nation a New Deal. How do his promises look today?

It must be admitted even by his candid admirers that he has had more success in getting the Old Deal back on its feet than in projecting us into a new era of human happiness and plenty.

The banks were restored to solvency and not placed under any more federal supervision and regulation than are essential to maintaining a minimum of integrity in our financial institutions.

Corporate financing has been subjected to regulations comparable to those governing individuals who used to seek to defraud under the mails. Deliberate deception is now penalized, but no unreasonable restrictions are placed upon those who have a decent investment to offer to the public.

The stock exchange has not been cramped in its investment activities. The money-changers still sit complacently in the Temple and "enjoy the show."

* * *

The legislation relating to business has been based upon the cornerstone of private profits rather than public service. There has been no alteration of the capitalistic ideals of profits and scarcity. The National Industrial Recovery Act was the brain child of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, which looked at its work and pronounced it good when the law was placed on the statute books. Then, when business got worried for fear it might have to deal reasonably with labor, the Supreme Court came promptly to the rescue and set aside the NRA.

Profits and prices have been advanced under Mr. Roosevelt more rapidly than wages. And while business is back to about 90 per cent of normal, there are over 11,000,000 unemployed in the country, according to the official government count.

President Roosevelt's farm policy has likewise been based upon the scarcity ideal. It has been designed to increase the purchasing power of the farm population, so that the farmers can buy more and help business. The cost of the farm program was to be borne by a processing tax, which the millers and others promptly passed on to the public in increased food costs. Business did not have to pay for the farm program. The consumers paid most of the bill. The whole farm program benefited business more than it did the farmer or the consumer.

The great salaried middle class has received no important benefits, except in the case of those unfortunate enough to be on relief. The only legislation directly aimed to benefit them was the insultingly low minimum wage provisions of the NRA. Prices and rents have gone up faster than voluntary salary increases or re-employment.

* * *

Labor was promised a new charter of liberties in Clause 7A of the NRA, but it provided an empty dream. The government, under the leadership of a former labor attorney, allowed itself to be cajoled and bluffed out of its logical position and its promises to labor by the arrogant defiance of the Steel Trust and the more subtle machinations of the automobile industry and complaisant government labor conciliators. There was little progress in labor organization under the NRA. There has been greater violence and wider use of soldiers in suppressing strikes since 1933 than at any comparable period since 1900.

We were promised a new era of "consumers' capitalism," but the interests of consumers were entrusted to representatives of great wealth, for the most part, and were relatively ignored. Men capable of representing the consumers effectively, Drs. Ogburn and Howe, left the service full of bitterness and disillusionment. America's great capacity to consumer and its relative inability to indulge this desirable consumption remain essentially as before 1933.

And yet, "Al" and the Moguls yell "Socialist" at the President.—New York *World-Telegram.*

Help Our Drive for More Readers of UNITY

● By securing at least one new subscriber within the next 30 days!